Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

# A framework to assess the extent and effectiveness of community-based forestry

FORESTRY WORKING PAPER
12
ISSN 2664-1062

SHOUT
SHARE
IT

# A framework to assess the extent and effectiveness of community-based forestry

**FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS**
Rome, 2019

**Required citation:**
FAO. 2019. *A framework to assess the extent and effectiveness of community-based forestry.* Forestry Working Paper no. 12.
Rome.

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO.

ISSN 2664-1070 [Online]
ISSN 2664-1062 [Print]

ISBN 978-92-5-131547-7
© FAO, 2019

Some rights reserved. This work is made available under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 IGO licence (CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO; https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/igo/legalcode).

Under the terms of this licence, this work may be copied, redistributed and adapted for non-commercial purposes, provided that the work is appropriately cited. In any use of this work, there should be no suggestion that FAO endorses any specific organization, products or services. The use of the FAO logo is not permitted. If the work is adapted, then it must be licensed under the same or equivalent Creative Commons licence. If a translation of this work is created, it must include the following disclaimer along with the required citation: "This translation was not created by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). FAO is not responsible for the content or accuracy of this translation. The original [Language] edition shall be the authoritative edition."

Disputes arising under the licence that cannot be settled amicably will be resolved by mediation and arbitration as described in Article 8 of the licence except as otherwise provided herein. The applicable mediation rules will be the mediation rules of the World Intellectual Property Organization http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/mediation/rules and any arbitration will be conducted in accordance with the Arbitration Rules of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL).

Third-party materials. Users wishing to reuse material from this work that is attributed to a third party, such as tables, figures or images, are responsible for determining whether permission is needed for that reuse and for obtaining permission from the copyright holder. The risk of claims resulting from infringement of any third-party-owned component in the work rests solely with the user.

Sales, rights and licensing. FAO information products are available on the FAO website (www.fao.org/publications) and can be purchased through publications-sales@fao.org. Requests for commercial use should be submitted via: www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request. Queries regarding rights and licensing should be submitted to: copyright@fao.org.

Cover photograph: © FAO/Honduras Forestry

# CONTENTS

Executive summary ..... vi
Acknowledgements ..... viii
Acronyms ..... ix

**1. Background ..... 1**

**2. Approach taken to develop an assessment framework ..... 3**
2.1 Defining 'community-based forestry' ..... 3
2.2 Defining 'tenure' ..... 5
2.3 A typology for community-based forestry regimes based mainly on tenure 6
2.4 Key social indicators associated with community-based forestry management ..... 10
2.5 Criteria and indicators for the assessment framework ..... 11

**3. Process for conducting the assessment ..... 15**

**4. Application of the assessment framework ..... 19**

References ..... 42

© CIFOR/JC HUAYLLAPUMA

# Boxes and tables

## Boxes

Box 1. Definition of community forestry ..... 4
Box 2. The bundle of rights ..... 5
Box 3. Spectrum of generic types of community-based forestry based on level of rights and responsibilities ..... 7
Box 4. Summary of rights associated with each generic community-based forestry regime ..... 9
Box 5. Description of key social indicators ..... 10
Box 6. Criteria and indicators to assess the extent and effectiveness of community-based forestry ..... 13

## Tables

Table 1. Policy objectives for each community-based forestry regime ..... 20
Table 2. Area of forest under different tenure regimes ..... 21
Table 3. Number of people and groups involved in community-based forestry regime ..... 22
Table 4. Institutionalization of community-based forestry into mainstream government planning and programmes ..... 24
Table 5. Civil society organizations to represent community-based forestry stakeholders ..... 25
Table 6. Assessment of tenure of community-based forestry regime ..... 27
Table 7. Assessment of the extent to which responsibilities enable or constrain community-based forestry management ..... 29
Table 8. Characterization of community-based forestry regime ..... 30
Table 9. Summary of the enabling environment for the community-based forestry regime ..... 31
Table 10. Change in forest area and condition ..... 33
Table 11. Change in level of threats ..... 34
Table 12. Change in availability of forest products ..... 35
Table 13. Change in key social indicators ..... 36
Table 14. Change in key financial indicators ..... 38
Table 15. Overall effectiveness of community-based forestry ..... 39
Table 16. Comparison of effectiveness of the various community-based forestry regimes ..... 40
Table 17. Overall effectiveness of community-based forestry compared with other forest tenure regimes ..... 40

# Executive summary

Community-based forestry (CBF) was implemented in countries with the premise that these would help improve governance of forests and local livelihoods. In the last four decades, there has been significant expansion in the area under CBF involving a broad array of initiatives that favour people's participation in forestry. CBF has evolved over the years towards institutionalization into mainstream national development programmes; empowerment of user groups; emergence of civil society organizations to represent CBF interests; restitution and privatization of forest land (mainly in Central and Eastern Europe); expansion of smallholder forestry, particularly in Asia; commercialization of forest goods and services; connections between smallholders/communities and private companies; and incorporation of a wider range of policy objectives into CBF (FAO 2016).

Various studies have attempted to document the extent, transitions and impact of CBF systems, but many of these have taken the case study approach, and there is little clarity of performance of these at the national levels. Lack of reliable data on effectiveness of CBF hinders analysis at the national, regional and global scales. It also makes it difficult to guide policy dialogue and to make informed decisions. Meanwhile, studies on the effectiveness of CBF that do exist indicate mixed performance. Some show major success with regards to improvements in forest governance and livelihoods of local communities. However, most of them suggest that CBF is delivering significantly below its potential.

This assessment framework can serve to provide important insights into the successes, as well as the continued shortcomings of CBF at the country level. It can also provide a means for determining and tracking the extent and effectiveness of the broad spectrum of CBF initiatives. Based on the level of devolution of rights and responsibilities, the tool categorizes the range of CBFs into participatory conservation, joint forest management, community forestry (partial to full devolution) and smallholder private forestry. The tool provides for an assessment of the institutionalization of CBF regimes in government and civil society, level of empowerment of local stakeholders involved in the CBF regime, the range and strength of rights, the various responsibilities as well as constraints to CBF. With regards to effectiveness, the tool provides for assessing changes in natural capital; social, institutional, and human capital; and the financial capital of CBF participants. The document provides for indicators that may be used across countries. This tool focuses on formal CBF initiatives recognized by statutory law, as the informal CBF arrangements not recognized by statutory law will likely be too diverse to allow for a national level assessment.

The tool may be used at any point of time to assess performance of all or specific CBF regimes or initiatives at the national level. An assessment can be especially useful to inform revision of forest policies and laws, in the design of new forestry initiatives such as REDD+ policies and programmes, or to strengthen forest-based enterprises.

When the assessment is conducted using a participatory approach involving government and non-government stakeholders, the tool can help to develop a common vision for strengthening performance of CBF initiatives in the specific country.

Well-performing CBF has the potential to rapidly restore forests in ecological terms and scale up sustainable forest management to the national level, while improving local livelihoods of billions of the most marginalized people around the world. In doing so, CBF has the potential to contribute significantly to a range of Sustainable Development Goals, in particular SDG 15 for supporting sustainable management of natural resources, SDG 1 for reducing poverty, SDG 2 for reducing hunger, SDG 10 for reducing inequality, and SDG 8 for fostering decent work and economic growth.

# Acknowledgements

This assessment framework was prepared by Don Gilmour under the overall technical guidance and coordination of Dominique Reeb, former Team Leader, Social Forestry, and former Forestry Officer Fred Kafeero (currently FAO Representative in Tanzania), in the FAO Forestry Department.

The framework includes contributions from a group of experts from around the world during a technical meeting held in Rome in May 2015. The following members of the peer review group are warmly acknowledged: James Bampton, Jan Bock, Peter Branney, Peter Cronkleton, Said Iddi, Yam Malla, Cecile Ndjebet, Mauro Salazar, Pedro Walpole and Yonas Yemshaw.

The assessment framework was subsequently tested in nearly 20 countries in Africa, Asia, Europe and Latin America. Experiences from the testing process were incorporated into the revision of the framework. FAO is grateful to the country consultants that contributed to the testing of the framework, in particular Ananie Abanda, Innocent Babili, Sony Baral, Mamadou Lamine Bodian, Rebeca Dumet, D. Enkhsaikhan, Muhammed Jaiteh, Alkali Jarjusey, George Kajembe, Felix Kalaba, Ohn Lwin, Stanley Makindi, Blaise F N'Guimbi, Léon Nguimbi, Khamila O'Reilly Becerra, Nidup Peljor, Guybertho Raveloson, Anthony Sangeda, Mauro E Salazar, Iryna Skulska, Levand Turyomurugyendo and Maria del Carmen Velasco.

The testing, revision and finalization process was further supported by Safia Aggarwal, Didier Habimana and Jean-Claude Nguinguiri of the FAO Forestry Department.

The document benefited also from inputs received from FAO experts during the peer review, including Andrew Taber, Jeffrey Campbell and Mette Wilkie. Many thanks to Malachite Marketing and Media for editing, graphic design and layout.

# Acronyms

| | |
|---|---|
| **CBF** | Community-Based Forestry |
| **CSOs** | Civil society organizations |
| **FAO** | Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations |
| **FRA** | FAO's Global Forest Resources Assessment |
| **NGO** | Non-governmental organization |
| **NWFPs** | Non-wood forest products |
| **PES** | Payments for Ecosystem Services |
| **RECOFTC** | Center for People and Forests |
| **REDD+** | Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation |
| **RRI** | Rights and Resources Initiative |
| **SDG** | Sustainable Development Goal |
| **SFM** | Sustainable Forest Management |
| **ToR** | Terms of Reference |

© D ALANGKARA

# 1 Background

During the past decade considerable attention has been paid to community-based forestry (CBF) and related forest tenure transformations. Both the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the Rights and Resources Initiative (RRI) have carried out regional and global assessments to chart these changes (White and Martin, 2002; FAO, 2011; RRI, 2014). The reports have highlighted a substantial increase during the past two decades in forest land under various types of CBF regimes. The associated transfer of power to local people inherent in these regimes involves various combinations of user rights, responsibilities and decision-making. However, there has not been a systematic assessment of the extent and effectiveness of the various types of CBF regimes around the world. Most approaches to assessing the extent and effectiveness of CBF have tended to take a case study approach. Few of these provide results to a national level and there are even fewer examples of regional or larger-scale assessments. One exception is a comprehensive assessment of 14 countries in the Asia and Pacific region recently carried out by the Center for People and Forests (RECOFTC) (2013).

The various CBF reviews in the past decades have highlighted the importance of transferring appropriate tenure rights to local communities and smallholders. They have also underscored the importance of other enabling conditions necessary for such systems of forestry to thrive. The purpose of this assessment is to assess at the country level the extent of CBF, the status with regards to the enabling conditions, and the impact of CBF on forests and local livelihoods.

© FAO/A. TABER

# 2 Approach taken to develop an assessment framework

## 2.1 DEFINING 'COMMUNITY-BASED FORESTRY'

This framework builds upon the extensive work of various organizations on community forestry over the past decades, and in particular on FAO reviews of community-based forestry (Arnold, 1992; Arnold, 2001; Gilmour, 2016). Following the approach taken in the FAO 2001 review of community forestry (Arnold, 2001), this assessment includes both collaborative forestry (forestry practised on land that has some form of communal tenure and requiring collective action) and smallholder forestry (forestry practised by smallholders on land that is privately owned). However, this assessment excludes agroforestry, i.e. fruit, fodder and timber trees integrated into farming systems, because the focus here is on the management of forests rather than scattered trees in the farming systems; although it is also recognized that the distinction between agroforestry and smallholder forestry is not always clear-cut.

© FAO/A TABER

The definition of community forestry currently used by RECOFTC, as shown in Box 1, is favoured in this assessment as an umbrella description of all initiatives that fall under the generic rubric of CBF, because of its comprehensive nature. The only caveat is that this assessment is concerned with the extent and effectiveness of **formal** CBF initiatives in rural areas recognized in statutory law, while acknowledging that informal initiatives not recognized by statutory law can be very effective locally. This is because informal initiatives are often very diverse, the extent may be unknown, and effectiveness may be difficult to generalize. The use of 'community forestry' as an umbrella term is avoided because of the specific connotation it conveys in many countries. In particular, 'community forestry' as applied in most countries focuses on forest management by communities, and does not include smallholders, a group that is explicitly included in this assessment.

BOX 1

**Definition of community forestry**
**(used as a generic definition of community-based forestry in this document)**

This document uses the RECOFTC definition of community forestry as a generic definition of CBF. The definition of community forestry has evolved over time from a narrowly defined technical field to a broader concept that includes *"...all aspects, initiatives, sciences, policies, institutions and processes that are intended to increase the role of local people in governing and managing forest resources."* It includes informal, customary and indigenous initiatives as well as formal, government-led initiatives. Community forestry covers social, economic and conservation dimensions in a range of activities including indigenous management of sacred sites of cultural importance, small-scale forest-based enterprises, smallholder forestry schemes, company—community partnerships, and decentralized and devolved forest management.
*Source:* RECOFTC (2013)

© FAO/Y KOPJANSKI

## 2.2 DEFINING 'TENURE'

CBF implies that communities hold tenure rights to defined areas of forest land. Tenure is generally defined as a 'bundle of rights'[1] and it can take many forms. The major rights of relevance to this discussion are presented in Box 2 below. It is based on the framework described by Schlager and Ostrom, 1992 as modified by RRI, 2012.

BOX 2

**The bundle of rights**

### Operational level rights

- Access – Right to enter a defined forest, including for livestock grazing.
- Withdrawal – Right to obtain 'products' of a resource, e.g. to harvest timber or non-wood forest products (NWFPs).

### Collective choice rights

- Management – Right to regulate internal use patterns and transform the resource by making improvements, e.g. make decisions over forest management such as to carry out silvicultural treatments.
- Exclusion – Right to determine who will have access to the forest and to exclude outsiders.
- Alienation – Right to sell or lease either or both of the management or exclusion rights or to use them as collateral.

### Duration of rights

- Length of time rights apply, e.g. whether they are time-bound or perpetual.

### Rights to compensation

- Whether the law guarantees due process and compensation if the rights are revoked or extinguished.

© FAO/C MARISA

[1] A discussion of tenure as a 'bundle of rights' is given in FAO (2011) and RRI (2012).

## 2.3 A TYPOLOGY FOR CBF REGIMES BASED MAINLY ON TENURE

The precise form of management under CBF regimes (particularly the level of empowerment) varies from country to country and also within countries, depending on a host of factors. In most countries, the government does not relinquish ownership of the land, but it may devolve management rights to communities. Mexico and Melanesian countries[2] in the Pacific region are exceptions, with their long-standing recognition of community ownership rights. In this assessment, the distinction is retained between the ownership of forest land by communities and smallholders, and devolved management rights on government-owned land.

Most countries have their own country-specific names for different types of CBF, which can lead to some confusion when trying to make comparisons between countries. Each form of CBF tends to have its own package of rights and responsibilities, and hence empowerment. For example, in the Philippines, CBF regimes where communities have management rights of forest land have included Community-Based Forest Management Agreements, Community-Based Timber Enterprises, Certificate of Forest Stewardship Agreements, Certificate of Ancestral Domain Title and Protected Area and Community-Based Resource Management Agreements. Similarly, in Nepal, at least six different CBF regimes have evolved, of which 'community forestry' is just one (Ojha, 2014). Indigenous reserves that incorporate forest land should be included as CBF regimes.

'Community forestry' is a term used in many countries, but the package of rights and responsibilities of communities in managing forest land under this regime varies considerably among countries. Hence, there is a need to categorize the distinguishing features of the different types of CBF regimes so that meaningful comparisons can be made both within and among countries.

While a precise typology of CBF regimes is difficult, different regimes can be categorized in terms of the rights and responsibilities of communities and smallholders in planning, implementation and benefit-sharing. This tells us a lot about the extent to which CBF is likely to achieve its objectives. Boxes 3 and 4 show a spectrum of generic types of CBF based largely on rights.

According to O'Hara (2013), there are five generic types of CBF regimes that range from passive participation of communities in forest governance and management, to active control over forest resources. These include: participatory conservation, joint forest management, community forestry with limited devolution, community forestry with full devolution (e.g. indigenous territories and reserves under full control of communities), and private smallholder forest ownership.

[2] These include Fiji, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu.

BOX 3

**Spectrum of generic types of community-based forestry based on level of rights and responsibilities (adapted from ideas in O'Hara, 2013)**

| Type of CBF | Generic description | Key characteristics |
|---|---|---|
| **1. Delegated** | Participatory conservation | This is a type of CBF in which government delegates what communities can or cannot do in specific forests within protected areas or in buffer zones. Communities are usually given responsibilities to protect forests with the purpose of meeting countries' goals in reaching conservation and biodiversity targets. The key characteristic of this CBF regime is that communities are provided access to the forest area and withdrawal rights typically to NWFPs for subsistence use only. They moreover have limited authority to make decisions with regards to forest management. |
| | | **Indicative rights:**<br>• Access – Rights to access forest<br>• Withdrawal – Sometimes limited rights to harvest prescribed NWFPs<br>• Management - No rights to make forest management decisions<br>• Exclusion – No rights to determine who will have access to the forest<br>• Alienation – No right to sell or lease either or both the management or exclusion rights, or to use them as collateral<br>• Duration of rights – No defined term<br>• Rights to compensation – No rights to obtain compensation if rights are withdrawn |
| **2. Shared** | Joint forest management | This is a type of CBF in which governments encourage local community involvement in the protection and conservation of government controlled forests by allowing them some benefits. Communities have some rights to collection and use of certain forest products, and communities share some management authority and responsibilities with the national forest department. However, the decision-making process is typically controlled by the government, and community rights and use of forest resources are typically very limited and prescribed by authorities. What differentiates this regime from participatory conservation is that communities are involved in managerial processes with formalization of agreements between government and communities and following forest management plans. |
| | | **Indicative rights:**<br>• Access – Rights to access forest<br>• Withdrawal – Generally rights to harvest NWFPs, but rights to harvest timber held by government agencies<br>• Management – Rights to make forest management decisions held by government agencies<br>• Exclusion – No rights to determine who will have access to the forest<br>• Alienation – No right to sell or lease either or both the management or exclusion rights, or to use them as collateral<br>• Duration of rights – May be a defined term fixed by a management plan<br>• Rights to compensation – No rights to obtain compensation if rights are withdrawn |

BOX 3
**Spectrum of generic types of community-based forestry (continued)**

| Type of CBF | Generic description | Key characteristics |
|---|---|---|
| **3. Partly devolved** | Community forestry with limited devolution | In this type of CBF, rights to access and manage forests and forest resources are partially devolved to local communities through formalized agreements between the government and communities, and through agreed-upon management plans. Rights generally do not include the sale of timber into the open market, but the sale of NWFP can be granted if it is included in a validated management plan. What differentiates this CBF type from joint forest management is that communities have some exclusion rights, and can therefore, to an extent, determine who can have access to the forest area. |
| | | **Indicative rights:**<br>• Access – Rights to access forest<br>• Withdrawal – Rights to harvest NWFPs (may be subject to a management plan)<br>• Management – Rights to make forest management decisions held by government agencies<br>• Exclusion – Limited rights to determine who will have access to the forest<br>• Alienation – No right to sell or lease either or both the management or exclusion rights, or to use them as collateral<br>• Duration of right – Generally defined term fixed by a management plan<br>• Rights to compensation – No rights to obtain compensation if rights are withdrawn |
| **4. Fully devolved** | Community forests with substantial or full devolution/ recognition of customary rights | In this type of CBF, rights to access and manage forests and forest resources are fully devolved to (or customary rights recognized of) local communities through formalized agreements between government and communities and through agreed-upon management plans. What differentiates this from CBF with limited devolution is that communities in this case have full exclusion rights and have the right to sell timber and NWFP into the open market, on the condition that these are part of the formal management plan. |
| | | **Indicative rights:**<br>• Access – Rights to access forest<br>• Withdrawal – Rights to harvest NWFPs and timber (generally prescribed in a management plan)<br>• Management – Rights to make forest management decisions (generally prescribed in a management plan)<br>• Exclusion – Rights to determine who will have access to the forest<br>• Alienation – No right to sell or lease either or both the management or exclusion rights, or to use them as collateral<br>• Duration of rights – Generally defined term fixed by a management plan<br>• Rights to compensation – No rights to obtain compensation if rights are withdrawn |

BOX 3

**Spectrum of generic types of community-based forestry (continued)**

| Type of CBF | Generic description | Key characteristics |
|---|---|---|
| **5. Owned** | Private forest ownership (collective or individual) | This is a type of regime in which ownership and use rights are held by individuals, households, groups or communities to manage the forest and to receive benefits. What differentiates this from CBF with full devolution is that private owners have the right of alienation, that is, the right to sell or lease the forest or to use it as collateral. |
| | | **Indicative rights:**<br>• Access – Rights to access forest<br>• Withdrawal – Rights to harvest NWFPs and timber<br>• Management – Rights to make forest management decisions<br>• Exclusion – Rights to determine who will have access to the forest<br>• Alienation – Rights to sell or lease either or both the management or exclusion rights, or to use them as collateral<br>• Duration of rights – Generally perpetual<br>• Rights to compensation – May be rights to obtain compensation if rights are withdrawn |

BOX 4

**Summary of rights associated with each generic type of community-based forestry regime**

| Type of CBF | Generic description | Bundle of rights | | | | | Duration of rights |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Access | Withdrawal | Management | Exclusion | Alienation | |
| | 1. Participatory conservation | X | NWFPs | | | | Not defined |
| | 2. Joint forest management | X | NWFPs | X | | | Fixed by management plan |
| | 3. Community forestry with limited devolution | X | NWFPs | X | X (Limited) | | Fixed by management plan |
| | 4. Community forestry with full devolution | X | NWFPs and timber | X | X | | Fixed by management plan/ regulatory framework |
| | 5. Private forest ownership | X | NWFPs and timber | X | X | X | Indefinite |

## 2.4 KEY SOCIAL INDICATORS ASSOCIATED WITH CBF MANAGEMENT

In most countries it is recognized that CBF has the potential to have significant positive social impacts. These can be categorized as contributions to social/institutional and human capital, equity and inclusiveness. These social indicators are elaborated in Box 5.

BOX 5

**Description of key social indicators**

**Social/institutional capital**

CBFs require collective action/decision-making, hence invariably requiring some form of community organization or group (e.g. forest user group, community forestry management group, community or smallholder cooperative or association). A key element of these groups to function well is the degree of social/institutional capital which is premised on the fact that social networks have value. Collective action and decision-making depend on the existence or establishment of functional social networks or groupings of people, which allow individuals to achieve things they could not achieve on their own.

In particular, robust social capital is a prerequisite for sustainable forest management by CBF groups. Social capital facilitates cooperation, lowers evasion of rules and hence costs of working together, gives people confidence to invest in collective activities knowing that others will also do so, and empowers them to take control of their own agenda. Social capital comprises four central aspects: relations of trust; reciprocity and exchanges; common rules, norms and sanctions; connectedness, networks and groups (Pretty and Ward, 2001).

**Human capital**

**Human capital is a collection of resources – all the knowledge, talents, skills, abilities, experience, intelligence, training, judgment and wisdom possessed individually and collectively in a population.** These resources are the total capacity of the people and represent a form of wealth which can be directed to achieve goals and objectives (Becker, 1994). Examples include formal and informal training that builds the knowledge and skills related to forest silviculture, community development, organizational management, leadership development and entrepreneurship.

**Equity**

Equity refers to getting a fair share, not necessarily an equal share. **Equity is understood as fairness in the decision-making processes and fair outcomes of such decisions** (Sunam and McCarthy, 2010). Equity can vary according to different situations and different cultures, but an important point is that an equitable system should not further marginalize the poor (Gilmour and Fisher, 1991). An example of equity in benefit-sharing would be a situation where poor households are explicitly identified and given special consideration such as exemption or reduced payment of CBF membership fees; allocation of land to cultivate NWFPs for sale; charging rates for forest products that are lower than those that apply to wealthy households; and providing low-interest loans to support income-generation activities.

**Inclusiveness**

Social inclusion in CBF is the **process of removing barriers and promoting incentives to increase the access of marginalized individuals and groups to natural resources and livelihood improvement activities so that they receive an equitable share of the benefits**. Among the most common marginalized individuals and groups are the poor, indigenous people, women, the landless and others with limited administrative and decision-making power. Women, in particular, represent half of the global population; and yet despite their increasing role in local economies and in the management of resources (often as a result of out-migration of rural men), their formal participation is often restricted due to various legal, economic and social barriers. Inclusiveness can be facilitated by ensuring that women and other marginalized groups are supported in the legal frameworks, that they hold posts in key decision-making bodies, and are provided skills necessary to carry out their functions.

## 2.5 CRITERIA AND INDICATORS FOR THE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK

The starting point in developing a framework for the assessment was to identify key attributes on the extent and effectiveness of each CBF regime, and then to decide how these can be grouped into criteria and indicators that will give a meaningful impression at a national level. The criteria and indicators also have to be generic enough to allow for comparability among countries and regions. The many attributes needed for the indicators have to be obtained largely from existing government sources, project databases, or scientific and technical literature.

It is tempting in such a task to collect as much information as possible. But, while some countries have comprehensive databases, many do not. As far as possible, indicators were selected on the basis of assembling the minimum set of attributes needed to make judgements on the extent and effectiveness of CBF at the national levels. It is hoped that relevant information will be available in most countries. Some of the indicators require quantitative data, but this can be supplemented with interpretations and qualifications based on a review of relevant literature and expert analysis. This is a challenging task and it would need to rely on expert interpretation of a range of diverse and often incomplete data sets.

Box 6 shows the key criteria and indicators that were selected which, when considered together, will enable a judgement to be made of the extent and effectiveness of CBF in a country at the national level. This box also indicates the specific Tables (1-17) which would need to be completed as part of the assessment.

© FAO/M LINTON

BOX 6
**Criteria and indicators to assess the extent and effectiveness of community-based forestry**

| Indicator number | Criteria and indicators |
|---|---|
| **Criterion 1: Extent and type of CBF** | |
| **1.1** | Context within which CBF operates |
| 1.1a | Policy objectives of each CBF regime in the country (Table 1) |
| 1.1b | Area and percent of forest land under different tenure regimes (Table 2) |
| 1.1c | Number of people and groups involved in CBF regime (Table 3) |
| **1.2** | Institutionalization of CBF in government and civil society |
| 1.2a | Institutionalization of CBF regimes into government policy, legislation, planning and programmes (Table 4) |
| 1.2b | Civil society organizations (apart from CBF membership groups) to represent CBF stakeholders (Table 5) |
| **1.3** | Level of empowerment of local stakeholders for CBF regime |
| 1.3a | Rights associated with CBF regimes (Table 6) |
| 1.3b | Responsibilities associated with CBF regimes (Table 7) |
| 1.3c | Characterization of CBF regimes by generic type (Table 8) |
| **Summary of enabling environment for CBF regime** | |
| Summary of indicators assessing the enabling environment for the CBF regime (Table 9) | |
| **Criterion 2: Effectiveness of CBF** | |
| **2.1** | Natural capital |
| 2.1a | Change in area and condition of forest for CBF regimes (Table 10) |
| 2.1b | Change in level of threats for CBF regimes (Table 11) |
| 2.1c | Change in quantity of forest products harvested for CBF regimes (Table 12) |
| **2.2** | Social, institutional and human capital |
| 2.2a | Change in key indicators of social/institutional and human capital, equity and inclusiveness for CBF regime (Table 13) |
| **2.3** | Financial capital |
| 2.3a | Change in availability of forest goods and services for subsistence use, income generation to households and community groups for CBF regime (Table 14) |
| **Summary of effectiveness of CBF** | |
| Overall effectiveness of CBF regimes (Table 15) | |
| Comparison of the effectiveness of the various CBF regimes (Table 16) | |
| Overall effectiveness of CBF regimes compared with other forest tenure regimes (Table 17) | |

Section 3 outlines the process and application for undertaking the assessment framework and describes the logic behind the selection of indicators for each of the criteria. The more important CBF regimes that exist in a country should be included in the assessment irrespective of whether they occur across the entire country or are concentrated in one geographic or administrative region such as a state or province.

© FAO

# 3 Process for conducting the assessment

This assessment framework is intended to help identify the key CBF tenure arrangements in a country, their strengths and limitations, and the impact on social/human/institutional, natural and financial capital. The assessment is intended to be carried out at the national level, but including key CBF regimes that occur in rural areas of the country, irrespective of whether they are found throughout the country or in a specific region such as a state or province.

The assessment is intended to use a collaborative and inclusive process involving consultations with all key government and non-government stakeholders.

The following process is recommended for conducting the assessment:

1. **Identify national consultant** – As a first step, a national consultant should be identified to lead this assessment. Ideally, the consultant will have previous experience working with non-state stakeholders such as local communities or smallholders in the forestry sector. The consultant should liaise with the Ministry or Department of Forestry and other stakeholders through the course of the assessment.

2. **Define scope of assessment** – The national consultant should work with government and non-government stakeholders as needed to define the scope of this assessment (i.e. identification of the CBF types to be assessed) (See Boxes 3 and 4). This would be further validated with interested stakeholders during the first introductory workshop noted in Step 4.

3. **Desk review** – The framework includes a series of tables requiring qualitative and some quantitative information. The national consultant should use existing government sources, project databases, and secondary literature to complete the tables. Several of the tables include a numerical rating on a scale of 0—5: 0 suggesting no provision or impact, and 5 suggesting full provision or impact. These ratings will be subjective but are intended to provide a 'snapshot' of the CBF situation in country. Thus, 0 = no provision or impact, 1= very weak provision or impact, 2 = weak provision or impact, 3 = some provision or impact, 4 = strong provision or impact, and 5 = very strong provision or impact. The national consultant should provide his or her rating and justification under the 'overall assessment'.

4. **Introductory workshop** – The national consultant in agreement with the government should consider holding an introductory workshop with stakeholders including relevant government institutions, key informants, experts from academia, research organizations, representatives of local community members, relevant NGOs, civil society groups, forest users, private sector operators, and others. The workshop should serve to orient participants to the assessment, present the process for conducting this assessment, share major findings from the desk review, and solicit input on gaps in information identified through the desk study.

5. **Key informant interviews** – To fill in gaps in information and to obtain diverse perspectives, the consultant should conduct interviews with a broad set of key informants knowledgeable about the forest tenure systems in country. These individuals may include the stakeholders noted above. Key informant interviews would be used to validate findings and to fill gaps, particularly in regard to the implementation of CBF.

6. **Field-level data collection** – Where possible, the consultant should consider obtaining field-level information from stakeholders on successes and challenges in the implementation of the CBF, functioning of institutions, and implications for stakeholders. This would involve choosing the particular tenure system to assess, selection of pilot sites, and conducting focus group discussions with a wide range of stakeholders to obtain different perspectives.

7. **Validation workshop** – Information obtained through the above steps should be validated in a national-level workshop, involving the same stakeholders as those consulted earlier. The workshop would provide the opportunity to not only validate the findings, but more importantly, to agree on priority areas for strengthening CBF. The workshop should also serve to validate the numerical ratings to indicators provided by the consultant to the degree possible. However, since the ratings are general impressions of the situation, and there will be disagreements among participants, the validation should place emphasis on refining the contents of the assessment, rather than focus on obtaining agreement on the ratings. Overall, the validation workshop will be critical for building consensus on the findings and on the priority areas of work.

8. **Final report** – Finally, the consultant should prepare a national assessment report including: i) an introductory section providing a brief overview of CBF in the country, ii) the completed tables with a paragraph or two of text in each table to explain and qualify the data and provide the sources of information, and iii) a succinct analysis of information collected highlighting key differences and similarities observed for the various CBF regimes. The consultant may consider also developing brief summary sheets (no more than two pages) on each CBF type analysed for use in the validation workshop.

© FAO/D HAYDUK

# 4 Application of the assessment framework

This section presents the series of tables referenced in Box 6. In particular, Tables 1 and 2 identify the CBF regimes that occur in the country and collate basic information about them. These should be completed once for all tenure types. Tables 3—15 assessing the enabling environment, effectiveness and summary of CBF should be completed separately for each different type of CBF regime. The easiest approach may be to complete Tables 3 to 15 for one CBF regime, then repeat the exercise for each of the other CBF regimes.

Table 16 allows for all the regimes to be brought together for comparison. Table 17 has been included to obtain an impression of the effectiveness of CBF compared with that of other forest management regimes. This should be completed for each CBF regime in the country.

Where information is not available, the relevant cell in the table can be marked as 'n/a'.

## CRITERION 1: EXTENT AND TYPE OF CBF

A workable approach to assess the extent and type of CBF can be sought in examining the context within which CBF operates, the extent to which it is institutionalized into government and civil society, and the level of empowerment of community and smallholder groups to exercise effective forest management.

### INDICATOR 1.1: CONTEXT OF CBF

#### Indicator 1.1a: Policy objectives of each CBF regime in the country

The different CBF regimes (essentially different types of tenure) in a country reflect different policy objectives. It is useful to clarify these, as CBF effectiveness needs to be judged against its objectives. These objectives may be stated explicitly in government policy statements or legislation, or they may need to be inferred from other documents. For example, it may be inferred that CBF aims to address forest degradation and improve livelihoods, without this being explicitly stated. Table 1 provides a framework to list the different types of CBF in a country and to summarize their policy objectives.

TABLE 1
**Policy objectives for each community-based forestry regime**

| Type of CBF regime (country-specific name) | Number of years of operation | Policy objectives | In which part of the regulatory framework are the objectives found (e.g. law, policy, sector strategy, departmental instructions, etc.) | In which part of the forest estate is the CBF regime allowed (e.g. all public forests, in buffer zones of protected areas, indigenous territories, etc.) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | | | | |
| 2. | | | | |
| 3. | | | | |
| 4. | | | | |

## Indicator 1.1b: Area and percent of forest land under different tenure regimes

The area of land under each CBF regime can generally be sourced from government databases, supplemented by data from other sources. Table 2 provides a format for the summation of forest land held under different regimes.

TABLE 2
**Area of forest under different tenure regimes**

| Forest category | Indicators | | Suggested source of data |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Area (ha) | % of total forest land | |
| **1. Total forest land** | | 100 | FAO's Global Forest Resources Assessment (FRA) reports<br>Country reports informing the FRA<br>National databases |
| **2. Forest land owned by government** | | | FRA reports<br>Country reports informing the FRA<br>National databases |
| 2.1 Forest land owned by government but with management rights devolved to communities | | | FRA reports<br>Country reports informing the FRA<br>National databases |
| 2.1a CBF type from Table 1 | | | National databases |
| 2.1b CBF type from Table 1 | | | National databases |
| 2.1c CBF type from Table 1 | | | National databases |
| 2.1d CBF type from Table 1 | | | National databases |
| **3. Forest land owned by communities** | | | FRA reports<br>Country reports informing the FRA<br>National databases |
| 3a CBF type from Table 1 | | | National databases |
| 3b CBF type from Table 1 | | | National databases |
| 3c CBF type from Table 1 | | | National databases |
| 3d CBF type from Table 1 | | | National databases |
| **4. Forest land owned by large owners* and corporations** | | | FRA reports<br>Country reports informing the FRA<br>National databases |
| **5. Forest land owned by smallholders*** | | | FRA reports<br>Country reports informing the FRA<br>National databases<br>Literature search<br>Local sources |

* The cut-off point between smallholders and large forest owners tends to be country- or region-specific, e.g. in Thailand a smallholder is considered to be someone who has access to less than 16 hectares of land (Boulay, 2010) whereas Harrison *et al.* (2002) noted that in Austria small-scale farm forestry is considered to apply to land holdings of between 1 and 200 hectares. In general, smallholders tend to be families rather than corporate entities, and are referred to as households in many countries.

As noted, in many countries the land under CBF regimes is held under a variety of tenure arrangements where the strength of tenure rights varies. Each of the different tenure categories can be listed separately (by area in ha and % of total forest land). Hence, categories 2.1 and 3 in Table 2 should be subdivided by CBF regime, if applicable.

### Indicator 1.1c: Number of people and groups involved in each CBF regime

The number of people and groups[3] involved in each type of CBF regime will give an indication of the relative importance of CBF across the rural landscape, and Table 3 provides a framework to record this information.

In applying the assessment framework from this point onwards, separate tables should be filled out for each CBF regime in the country (e.g. smallholder forestry, community forestry, indigenous protected areas and village forestry) – with the exception of Table 16, where the different CBF regimes in the country are brought together for comparison.

TABLE 3
**Number of people and groups involved in community-based forestry regime**

| Type of CBF regime (country-specific name from Table 1): | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |
| National population | Rural population | Number of people involved in CBF regime | Number of formal groups in each CBF regime | % of rural population involved in each CBF regime |
| | | | | |

## INDICATOR 1.2: INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF CBF IN GOVERNMENT AND CIVIL SOCIETY

### Indicator 1.2a: Institutionalization of CBF regime into government policy, legislation, planning and programmes

In many countries, formal CBF started as relatively small-scale policy experiments where essential inputs (such as technical skills and budget) were often provided by external agencies. Experience suggests that it often takes some years for CBF to be tested, assessed and refined to ensure it is suitable for a country's specific conditions. It

[3] Most collaborative forms of CBF operate on the basis of formal groups rather than individuals. These are generally location based (such as a collection of hamlets, a village or a political-administrative unit), but they may be ethnically based (such as a clan or tribal group). In most situations the defined group is the legally recognized entity to which rights and responsibilities are allocated.

is only after there is a degree of confidence among policy-makers that CBF is a useful forest management modality that it is integrated into national development priorities and supported by government institutions. Significant scaling up and expansion from project- to programme-scale requires, among other things, the development of an enabling regulatory framework. Scaling up is only possible where governments take strong ownership and where the CBF regime generates sufficient benefits to communities to outweigh costs. The extent to which CBF has been institutionalized into government policy, legislation, plans and programmes is an indication of the likelihood that CBF will succeed and make a significant contribution to both national development and community objectives. Table 4 provides a framework to document the extent to which CBF is institutionalized into government plans and programmes.

© J-C NGUINGUIRI

TABLE 4

**Institutionalization of community-based forestry into mainstream government planning and programmes**

| **Type of community-based forestryregime (country-specific name from Table 1):** | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | |
| **CBF specifically mentioned in forest or other policy**<br><br>**Y/N** | **CBF specifically mentioned in forest or other legislation**<br><br>**Y/N** | **CBF fully incorporated into government plans and institutions (as opposed to CBF being treated as a project)**<br><br>**Y/N** | **Description of organizational arrangements (e.g. national/ provincial CBF unit or division)** | **Human resources** | | | **Is the CBF regime operational?**<br><br>**Y/N** | **Budget allocated for CBF implemen-tation**<br><br>**In local currency** | **Documentation issued to formalize CBF (e.g. delimitation, mapping, documentation, registration of forest land)**<br><br>**Mostly/rarely** |
| | | | | **Total number of government staff with this CBF regime included in their ToR** | **Total number of forestry staff or equivalent in the department** | **Total number of non-government staff with this CBF regime included in their ToR** | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| **Overall assessment of the institutionalization of this CBF regime**<br><br>Based on the above, give a rating on a scale of 0 to 5, with 0 being no institutionalization and no dedicated staff and 5 being full institutionalization of CBF into government policy, legislation, planning and operational structures | | | | **Overall score:**<br><br>Explanation: | | | | | |

## Indicator 1.2b: Civil society organizations (apart from CBF membership groups) to represent CBF stakeholders

As noted above, in some countries where CBF has made significant contributions to local livelihoods and the national economy, it has become institutionalized into regular government activities. In some cases it has made the further transition to become a people's programme that is driven to a large extent by civil society advocacy rather than a government line agency. In such cases, civil society organizations (CSOs) have emerged that represent CBF stakeholders and often act to balance community interests with those of government and other forest stakeholders. They could include networks, alliances, associations or federations that have a specific mandate to represent and advocate for CBF. An indication of the presence of such organizations is a measure of the likely resilience and effectiveness of CBF. The presence or absence of organizations that represent CBF stakeholders can be recorded in Table 5 along with an indication of the type of membership.

TABLE 5
**Civil society organizations to represent community-based forestry stakeholders**

| **Type of CBF regime (country-specific name from Table 1):** | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |
| **CBF stakeholders represented by CSOs**<br><br>**Y/N** | **Name or type of CSO*** | **Membership type**/ number of members** | **Type of engage-ment*** ** | **CSO influence in policy-making**<br><br>**Y/N** |
| | | | | |
| **Overall assessment of the CSOs to represent CBF stakeholders**<br><br>Based on the above, give a rating on a scale of 0 to 5, with 0 being no CSO and 5 being well-established and effective CSO reaching most CBF stakeholders and engaging effectively in policy discourse. | **Overall score:**<br><br>Explanation: | | | |

* Type of CSO, e.g. network, alliance, association, federation, etc.
** Membership type, e.g. individuals, CBF committees, user groups, etc.
*** This may include service provision to members, policy advocacy with government, support to communities in the implementation of CBF, such as helping to register community rights, delimit forest area, support development of management plans, etc.

## INDICATOR 1.3: LEVEL OF EMPOWERMENT OF LOCAL STAKEHOLDERS FOR CBF REGIME

### Indicator 1.3a: Rights associated with CBF regime

It is generally hypothesized that the stronger each of the rights in the 'bundle of rights' that constitutes tenure is held, the more effective CBF is likely to be in terms of achieving its intended policy objectives (See Section 2.3 for a description of each of the rights). Hence, an assessment of the presence of each right and its strength will assist in judging the validity of this hypothesis and the likely effectiveness of the type of CBF regime under consideration.

Strong rights are those that are embedded in a country's constitution or statutory law. Weak rights are those that are contained in lower levels of the regulatory framework, such as ministerial directions, rules and regulations. Strong rights cannot be revoked easily or modified by bureaucratic discretion. Locally recognized rights that are not formally recognized by the state would be weak, even though they may be locally effective. Table 6 outlines an assessment matrix for rights associated with the CBF regime.

© FAO/K SANJEEV

TABLE 6
**Assessment of tenure of community-based forestry regime**

| **Type of CBF regime (country-specific name from Table 1):** | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | |
| **Type of rights** | **Right present Y/N** | **Duration of rights** | **Strength of rights** | | **Qualification of rights (e.g do all members of the CBF group enjoy equal rights)** |
| | | | **Indicators** | | |
| | | | **Weak** | **Strong** | |
| Access – right to enter a defined forest with adequate area to meet essential needs | | | | | |
| Withdrawal – right to obtain 'products' of a resource, e.g. harvest timber, NWFPs, other | | | | | |
| • Products for subsistence use | | | | | |
| • Products for commercial use (e.g. NWFPs, timber, other) | | | | | |
| Management – right to regulate internal use patterns and transform the resource by making improvements, e.g. make decisions to manage forests, such as carry out silvicultural treatments | | | | | |
| Exclusion – right to determine who will have access to the forest and to exclude outsiders | | | | | |
| Alienation – right to sell or lease either or both the management or exclusion rights, or to use them as collateral | | | | | |
| Compensation if rights are revoked or extinguished | | | | | |
| **Overall assessment of strength of tenure rights**<br><br>Based on the above, give a rating on a scale of 0 to 5, with 0 being no tenure security and 5 being very strong tenure security, where the exercise of rights is largely unconstrained | **Overall score:**<br><br>Explanation: | | | | |

## Indicator 1.3b: Responsibilities associated with CBF regime

In most countries, communities and smallholders are required to accept a range of responsibilities in exchange for the rights to manage their forests and share in the benefits. These are generally prescribed in the regulatory framework (laws, policies, rules and regulations, etc.) and may include preparing a management plan, carrying out a forest inventory, obtaining approval from government officials to harvest and/or sell forest products, etc. These responsibilities provide insights into why some CBF regimes deliver on their objectives, while other seemingly similar regimes deliver less well. Table 7 provides a framework for assessing the extent to which various responsibilities enable or constrain effective implementation of CBF.

© FAO FORESTRY

TABLE 7

**Assessment of the extent to which responsibilities enable or constrain community-based forestry management**

| **Type of CBF regime (country-specific name from Table 1):** | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | |
| **Responsibilities (generally prescribed in the regulatory framework) *** | **Responsibility required** Y/N | **Extent to which responsibilities enable/constrain CBF management** | | | **Qualification of the assessment (e.g. why and how does responsibility enable/ constrain CBF management)** |
| | | **Indicators** | | | |
| | | **Enable **** | **Moderately constrain ***** | **Constrain ******** | |
| Register CBF group | | | | | |
| Prepare management plan | | | | | |
| Carry out forest inventory | | | | | |
| Obtain approval from government officials to harvest NWFPs, including wildlife | | | | | |
| Obtain approval from government officials to graze animals | | | | | |
| Obtain approval from government officials to harvest fuelwood | | | | | |
| Obtain approval from government officials to harvest timber | | | | | |
| Obtain approval from government officials to transport or sell forest products into open market | | | | | |
| Pay taxes to government on harvest/ sale of forest products | | | | | |
| * Other | | | | | |
| **Overall assessment of extent to which all responsibilities (combined) enable/constrain CBF management**<br><br>Based on the above, give a rating on a scale of 0 to 5, with 0 being CBF management is severely constrained by imposed responsibilities, and 5 being management is largely unconstrained by imposed responsibilities | **Overall score:**<br><br>Explanation: | | | | |

* Add rows as necessary to accommodate locally relevant responsibilities, such as carry out environmental impact assessment; obtain independent certification of products harvested, banning of chainsaws for harvesting timber, etc.

** Responsibility is simple and easy to fulfil and requires no external support.

*** Responsibility can be fulfilled but is moderately complex and requires some external financial and/ or technical support.

**** Responsibility is complex and difficult, and/or costly and time-consuming to fulfil and requires considerable external financial and/or technical support.

## Indicator 1.3c: Characterization of CBF regime by generic type

Based on the assessments carried out in Tables 6 and 7, an evaluation can be made of where the CBF regime being assessed is located on the spectrum shown in Boxes 3 and 4. The results can be entered into Table 8.

TABLE 8
**Characterization of community-based forestry regime**

Table 8 characterizes the CBF regime based on balance of rights and responsibilities, and hence empowerment, against the spectrum of rights presented in Boxes 3 and 4.

| Type of CBF regime – from Table 1 (country-specific name) | Generic characterization of CBF regime (type and name of CBF regime – 1 to 5 from Boxes 3 and 4) |
|---|---|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

# OVERALL SUMMARY OF ENABLING ENVIRONMENT FOR CBF REGIME

## Summary of key indicators to assess level of enabling environment for the CBF regime

Summarize the enabling environment for CBF regimes in Table 9 using ratings from Tables 4, 5, 6 and 7. The table should be completed for each tenure regime separately.

TABLE 9
**Summary of enabling environment for the community-based forestry regime**

| **Type of CBF regime (country-specific name from Table 1):** | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | |
| | **Summary of indicator ratings from Tables 4, 5, 6 and 7*** | | | | | |
| **Key indicators** | **(0)** | **(1)** | **(2)** | **(3)** | **(4)** | **(5)** |
| Institutionalization of CBF into government (Table 4) | | | | | | |
| CSOs representing CBF (Table 5) | | | | | | |
| Strength of tenure rights (Table 6) | | | | | | |
| Constraining/enabling effect of regulatory responsibilities (Table 7) | | | | | | |
| **Overall summary of CBF regime in terms of the enabling environment in which it operates**<br><br>Rating on a scale of 0 to 5, with 0 being not enabling for CBF and 5 being highly enabling for CBF | **Overall score:**<br><br>Explanation: | | | | | |

* Place an "X" in the square that corresponds to the rating number given in the relevant table.

## CRITERION 2: EFFECTIVENESS OF CBF

The effectiveness of CBF can be considered from the viewpoint of the policy objectives that are set[4]. These are frequently framed to include both biophysical and socio-economic outcomes that collectively contribute to sustainable forest management and enhanced livelihoods. The framework for this assessment defines livelihoods in terms of three key capital (or asset) classes: natural; social, institutional, human; and financial capitals (adapted from the livelihoods framework described by DFID, 1999). This approach was chosen as these three types of capital are frequently reported on in the literature and, taken together, provide a comprehensive picture of the most common CBF outcomes.

Most assessments of the effectiveness of CBF have been carried out on a case study basis, and there are few examples of scaling up case study results to a national scale. For this reason it may be necessary to judge the effectiveness of CBF by making assessments based on as many case studies as possible.

[4] There may be situations where policy objectives are found to be problematic in terms of adverse effects on communities, but this needs to be drawn out in the accompanying narrative.

## INDICATOR 2.1: NATURAL CAPITAL

### Indicator 2.1a: Change in area and condition of forest for CBF regime

The most important indicators of changes to the natural capital (i.e. those concerning the biophysical outcomes) relate to the forest itself, its condition and biodiversity. Changes in forest condition since the commencement of a CBF regime can be judged from indicators such as changes in area of forest, wood volume or biomass and regeneration. Changes in biodiversity can be judged from changes in species diversity over time. In many cases these changes will need to be inferred from case studies. Table 10 outlines a framework for recording the relevant changes for the CBF regime under consideration.

TABLE 10
**Change in forest area and condition**

| **Type of CBF regime (country-specific name from Table 1):** | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | |
| **Forest condition indicators** | **Baseline condition**** | **Change in forest indicators** | | | **Qualification of assessment (why; to what extent, etc.)** |
| | | **Increase** | **No change** | **Decrease** | |
| Area of forest | | | | | |
| Wood volume/biomass | | | | | |
| Regeneration | | | | | |
| Biodiversity (species diversity – flora and fauna) | | | | | |
| Ecosystem services: erosion control, water quality and quantity, and soil fertility | | | | | |
| Other* | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| **Overall assessment of forest condition**<br><br>Based on the above, give a rating on a scale of 0 to 5, with 0 being a decrease in forest condition and 5 a substantial improvement in forest condition, or maintenance of a baseline situation of good forest condition | **Overall score:**<br><br>Explanation: | | | | |

* Add rows as necessary to accommodate locally relevant indicators.
** Rate baseline condition of the forest as poor, medium or good quality.

## Indicator 2.1b: Change in level of threats for CBF regime

Another indication of the effectiveness of a CBF regime is a reduction in the level of threats that can be associated with improved overall management since commencement of the regime. Table 11 provides a framework to record relevant changes.

TABLE 11
**Change in level of threats**

| **Type of CBF regime (country-specific name from Table 1):** | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | |
| **Threats** | **Baseline condition**** | **Change in level of threats** | | | **Qualification of assessment (why; to what extent, etc.)** |
| | | **Increase** | **No change** | **Decrease** | |
| Unplanned or wild fire | | | | | |
| Illegal logging | | | | | |
| Unsustainable fuelwood extraction | | | | | |
| Unsustainable charcoal production | | | | | |
| Wildlife poaching | | | | | |
| Encroachment for agricultural purposes | | | | | |
| Land grabbing | | | | | |
| Other* | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| **Overall assessment of change in level of threats**<br><br>Based on the above, give a rating on a scale of 0 to 5, with 0 being an overall increase in threat level and 5 an overall reduction in threat level (or a maintenance of the status quo in the event that the baseline situation was rated as "low") | **Overall score:**<br><br>Explanation: | | | | |

* Add rows as necessary to accommodate locally relevant threats.
** Rate baseline condition of the threats to the forest as high, medium or low.

## Indicator 2.1c: Change in quantity of forest products sustainably harvested for CBF regime

Changes in the quantity of forest products harvested give an indication of the extent to which CBF is able to meet the forest product needs of communities and smallholders. The most common forest products accessed by communities and smallholders include timber, woodfuel, poles, fodder, wildlife and NWFPs. Table 12 gives a framework for assessing the changes in the quantity of forest products sustainably harvested for the CBF regime since commencement.

TABLE 12
**Change in availability of forest products**

| **Type of CBF regime (country-specific name from Table 1):** | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | |
| **Forest products sustainably harvested** | **Baseline situation of forest products harvested**** | **Change in quantity of forest products sustainably harvested** | | | **Qualification of assessment (why; to what extent, etc.)** |
| | | **Increase** | **No change** | **Decrease** | |
| Timber | | | | | |
| Woodfuel | | | | | |
| Poles | | | | | |
| Fodder | | | | | |
| Leaf mulch | | | | | |
| Wildlife | | | | | |
| Food (directly from the forest) | | | | | |
| NWFPs (other than food) | | | | | |
| Other* | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| **Overall assessment of changes in quantity of forest products harvested**<br><br>Give a rating on a scale of 0 to 5, with 0 being a decrease in quantity of forest products sustainably harvested and 5 being a substantial increase in the quantity of forest products sustainably harvested (or a maintenance of the status quo in the event that the baseline situation was rated as "substantial amount harvested") | **Overall score:**<br><br>Explanation: | | | | |

* Add rows as necessary to accommodate locally relevant products.
** Rate the baseline situation of forest products harvested as none harvested, a medium amount harvested or a substantial amount harvested.

## INDICATOR 2.2: SOCIAL/INSTITUTIONAL/HUMAN CAPITAL

### Indicator 2.2a: Change in key social indicators of social/institutional and human capital, equity and inclusiveness for CBF regime

Improvement in social outcomes is generally an explicit part of the rationale for adopting CBF. Table 13 provides a framework for assessing the impact of CBF on key social indicators since commencement of the regime (Box 5 gives descriptions of the first four of these indicators).

TABLE 13
**Change in key social indicators**

| **Type of CBF regime (country-specific name from Table 1):** | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | |
| **Social indicators*** | **Baseline situation of social indicators**** | **Change in social indicators** | | | **Summary of situation (description)** |
| | | **Increase** | **No change** | **Decrease** | |
| Social/institutional capital (social and institutional arrangements to manage forests) | | | | | |
| Human capital (knowledge and skills to manage forest, such as preparing management plans, carrying out silvicultural treatments, leadership and entrepreneurship) | | | | | |
| Equity (equitable sharing of costs and benefits, including special provisions for the marginalized as needed) | | | | | |
| Inclusiveness (marginalized individuals and others such as women and youth included in membership, and sharing equitably in decision-making processes) | | | | | |
| Use of forest goods and/or services for cultural/spiritual purposes | | | | | |
| Recognition and use of traditional and indigenous knowledge | | | | | |
| **Overall assessment of changes in social indicators**<br><br>Based on the above, give a rating on a scale of 0 to 5, with 0 being an overall decrease in social indicators and 5 being a substantial increase in social indicators (or a maintenance of the status quo in the event that the baseline situation was rated as "high") | **Overall score:**<br><br>Explanation: | | | | |

* Add rows as necessary to accommodate locally relevant social indicators.
** The baseline situation of social indicators (i.e. the situation when CBF was commenced) can be rated as low, medium or high.

## INDICATOR 2.3: FINANCIAL CAPITAL

### Indicator 2.3a: Change in availability of forest goods and services for subsistence use, income generation to households and community groups for CBF regime

Continuing community support for CBF is contingent on community members receiving sufficient benefits from their involvement to outweigh the costs involved. Many, but not all, benefits have a financial value, although it is not always easy to assign a monetary value to them. Much of the rationale for promoting CBF is based on a stated intention of improving the livelihoods of rural people. This generally involves improving access to subsistence goods and services and increasing income from the sale of goods and services. Table 14 provides a framework to assess the change in financial indicators of the major forest goods and services derived from CBF management since commencement of the regime.

TABLE 14
**Change in key financial indicators**

| **Type of CBF regime (country-specific name from Table 1):** | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | |
| **Financial indicators** | **Baseline condition of financial indicators*** | **Change primarily at household (H) or community (C) level** | **Change in financial indicators** | | | **Summary of situation (explanation, amount of financial benefit)** |
| | | | **Increase** | **No change** | **Decrease** | |
| Income from sale of timber | | | | | | |
| Income from sale of fuelwood | | | | | | |
| Income from sale of wildlife | | | | | | |
| Income from sale of NWFPs (apart from wildlife) | | | | | | |
| Income from payments for ecosystem services (PES) | | | | | | |
| Income adequate to meet basic household needs | | | | | | |
| Income to the particularly vulnerable households/ groups** | | | | | | |
| Use of income generated from CBF activities to re-invest in forest management | | | | | | |
| Use of income generated from CBF activities for social purposes (e.g. by supporting school buildings, paying school teachers' salaries, providing low-income loans to marginalized groups/ individuals, etc.) | | | | | | |
| Financing opportunities such as micro-credit and community fund for investing in business enterprises | | | | | | |
| Community-based enterprises established | | | | | | |
| Jobs directly related to CBF activities | | | | | | |
| **Overall assessment of changes in economic indicators**<br><br>Based on the above, give a rating on a scale of 0 to 5, with 0 being a decrease in financial indicators and 5 being a substantial increase in financial indicators (or a maintenance of the status quo in the event that the baseline situation was rated as "high") | **Overall score:**<br><br>Explanation: | | | | | |

* The baseline situation of financial indicators (i.e. the situation when CBF was commenced) can be rated as low, medium or high.

** Vulnerable groups here refers to the poor households, women, women-headed households, landless, indigenous, or others. Please specify under overall assessment.

## OVERALL SUMMARY OF EFFECTIVENESS OF CBF

### Summary of effectiveness of CBF regime in enhancing natural, social/ institutional/human and financial capital and overall effectiveness

It is useful to obtain an impression of the overall effectiveness of each CBF regime in achieving its objectives. This can be done by combining the ratings for each of the key indicators into one table (Table 15).

TABLE 15
**Overall effectiveness of community-based forestry**

| **Type of CBF regime (country-specific name from Table 1):** | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | |
| | **Summary of indicator ratings from Tables 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14, and overall effectiveness of achieving objectives*** | | | | | |
| **Key indicators** | **(0)** | **(1)** | **(2)** | **(3)** | **(4)** | **(5)** |
| **Natural capital** | | | | | | |
| Area and condition of forest (Table 10) | | | | | | |
| Threats to forest (Table 11) | | | | | | |
| Quantity of products sustainably harvested (Table 12) | | | | | | |
| Summary of effectiveness of CBF regime in enhancing natural capital (average of above three indicators) | | | | | | |
| **Social/institutional/human capital** | | | | | | |
| Social indicators (Table 13) | | | | | | |
| **Financial capital** | | | | | | |
| Financial indicators (Table 14) | | | | | | |
| **Overall assessment of effectiveness in moving towards SFM and enhancing livelihoods**<br><br>Based on the above, give a rating on a scale of 0 to 5, with 0 being ineffective in moving towards SFM and enhancing livelihoods and 5 being highly effective in moving towards SFM and enhancing livelihoods | **Overall score:**<br><br>Explanation: | | | | | |

* Place an "X" in the square that corresponds to the rating number given in the relevant table.

## Comparative effectiveness of all CBF regimes in a country in moving towards SFM and enhancing livelihoods

In those countries with several types of CBF regime, it is of interest to compare their relative effectiveness in moving towards SFM and enhancing livelihoods. Table 16 provides a framework for making this comparison.

TABLE 16
**Comparison of effectiveness of the various community-based forestry regimes**

| Type of CBF regimes (country-specific names from Table 1) | Generic types of CBF regimes (from Table 8) | Level of enabling environment (from Table 9) | Overall effectiveness in achieving SFM and enhancing livelihoods (from Table 15) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

## Perceptions of overall effectiveness of CBF regime compared with other forest tenure regimes in moving towards SFM and enhancing livelihoods

As well as rating the effectiveness of CBF in achieving its objectives, it is useful to gain an impression of the comparative performance of CBF against other types of forest management, such as concession logging or direct government forest management, in moving towards SFM and enhancing livelihoods. Table 17 provides a framework for making this qualitative judgement.

TABLE 17
**Overall effectiveness of community-based forestry compared with other forest tenure regimes**

| Type of CBF regime (country-specific name from Table 1): | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |
| Type of non-CBF forest tenure regime | Perception of effectiveness of non-CBF forest tenure regimes compared with CBF | | | Comments |
| | Worse | Similar | Better | |
| | | | | |
| 1. | | | | |
| 2. | | | | |
| 3. | | | | |

© A'MM PAZ

# References

**Arnold, J.E.M.** 1992 (reprinted 1995). *Community Forestry: Ten years in review*. FAO, Rome.

**Arnold, J.E.M.** 2001. *Forests and People: 25 years of community forestry*. FAO, Rome.

**Becker, G.S.** 1994. Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis, with special reference to education (3rd ed.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

**Boulay, A.** 2010. *Contract tree farming and smallholders: Drivers of adoption in Thailand*. Crawford School of Economics and Government, ANU, Canberra, Australia. (PhD thesis)

**DFID.** 1999. *Sustainable livelihood guidance sheets*. London, U.K. https://www.ennonline.net/attachments/872/section2.pdf

**FAO.** 2011. *Reforming forest tenure: Issues, principles and process*. FAO Forestry Paper 165, Rome.

**Gilmour, D.A.** 2016. *Forty years of community-based forestry: A review of its extent and effectiveness.* FAO Forestry Paper 176, Rome.

**Gilmour, D.A. & Fisher, R.J.** 1991. *Villagers, Forests and Foresters – The Philosophy, Process and Practice of Community Forestry in Nepal*. Sahayogi Press, Kathmandu, Nepal.

**Harrison, S., Herbohn, J. & Niskanen, A.** 2002. Non-industrial, smallholder, small-scale and family forestry: What's in a Name? *Small-scale Forest Economics, Management and Policy*, 1(1): 1–11.

**O'Hara, P.** 2013. *From delegation to devolution: Key lessons from 10 years of PFM implementation in SW Ethiopia.* NTFP-PFM Programme Briefing Note Number 7, Addis Ababa. http://wetlandsandforests.hud.ac.uk/forests/ntfp_pfm/publications/Briefing%20Notes/Key%20Lessons%20from%2010%20Years%20of%20PFM%20in%20SW%20Ethiopia.pdf

**Ojha, H.R.** 2014. Beyond the 'local community': the evolution of multi-scale politics in Nepal's community forestry regimes. *International Forestry Review* 16 (3): 339–353.

**Pretty, J. & Ward, H.** 2001. Social capital and the environment. *World Development*, 29 (2): 209–227.

**RECOFTC.** 2013. *Community forestry in Asia and the Pacific: Pathway to inclusive development*. Bangkok, Thailand.

**RRI.** 2012. *What Rights? A comparative analysis of developing countries' national legislation on community and Indigenous Peoples' forest tenure rights*. Rights and Resources Initiative, Washington D.C.

**RRI.** 2014. *What future for reform? Progress and slowdown in forest tenure reform since 2002.* Rights and Resources Initiative, Washington, D.C.

**Schlager, E. & Ostrom, E.** 1992. Property-rights regimes and natural resources: A conceptual analysis. *Land Economics*, August 1992, 68 (3): 249–62.

**Sunam, R.K. & McCarthy, J.F.** 2010. Advancing equity in community forestry: Recognition of the poor matters. *International Forestry Review* 12 (4): 370–382

**White, A. & Martin, A.** 2002. Who Owns the World's Forests? Forest Tenure and Public Forests in Transition. *Forest Trends*, Washington, DC.

# Notes

# Notes

# Notes

*For more information, please contact:*

Forestry Department
E-mail: FO-Publications@fao.org
Web address: www.fao.org/forestry/en
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00153 Rome, Italy

ISBN 978-92-5-131547-7 ISSN 2664-1062

9 789251 315477

CA4987EN/1/06.19